

Accountability System for 2009 and Beyond – Standard Procedures Educator Focus Group Proposal

State Assessment Indicators

1. Phase-in of TAKS (Accommodated). The TAKS (Accommodated), previously known as TAKS-Inclusive, was administered in 2005-06 and 2006-07 in grades and subjects that were not assessed with the State Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II). Beginning with the 2007-08 school year, the TAKS (Accommodated) expanded to include the grades and subjects that were tested with SDAA II. The TAKS (Accommodated) is a form of TAKS that has the same test questions and the same passing standards as the general assessment, but that includes format accommodations (larger font, fewer items per page, etc.) and contains no embedded field-test items. In addition, certain accommodations are allowed on this version of the test that are not available on the general assessment.

During the 2007 accountability development cycle, the Educator Focus Group and Commissioner's Accountability Advisory Committee (CAAC) reviewed options for inclusion of the TAKS (Accommodated) results in the state accountability system. Their recommendation was to combine the TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated) results into a single indicator beginning with the 2008 accountability ratings. The advisory groups noted several reasons that a combined indicator was appropriate to incorporate in the ratings beginning in 2008.

- Students served by special education who take the TAKS (Accommodated) form are assessed on the same test questions given to all students, including special education students, who are assessed on the regular TAKS.
- The TAKS (Accommodated) uses the TAKS *Met Standard* and *Commended Performance* student passing standards.
- Special education students taking the regular state assessment tests on grade level have been included in the state rating system since 1998-99.
- Combining the results maintains the same number of measures in the state accountability system.
- Inclusion of TAKS (Accommodated) with TAKS parallels the use of the combined results in the Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) system beginning in 2007-08.

As planned, in 2009 the TAKS (Accommodated) results that will be combined with the TAKS results will be for the same grades and subjects used in 2008. These are:

Science (grades 5, 8, 10, & 11—English; grade 5—Spanish)
Social Studies (grades 8, 10, & 11)
English Language Arts (ELA) (grade 11)
Mathematics (grade 11)

Focus Group Recommendation:

Beginning in 2010, the TAKS indicator will include these additional TAKS (Accommodated)-tested grades and subjects:

Reading/ELA (grades 3 through 10—English; grades 3 through 6—Spanish)
Mathematics (grades 3 through 10—English; grades 3 through 6—Spanish)
Writing (grades 4 and 7—English; grade 4—Spanish)

Rationale: The phase-in schedule for use of TAKS (Accommodated) results follows the established "report, report, use" policy. Educators were given advance notice of the plan in both the 2007 and 2008 accountability manuals.

2. TAKS Standards. Standards for 2009 were published in the *2008 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule to provide districts and campuses with advance notice before the 2008-09 school year began. The 2009 *Academically Acceptable* standards are 70% for reading/English language arts (ELA), writing, and social studies; 55% for mathematics; and 50% for science. These standards represent increases of five percentage points to the *Academically Acceptable* standards for four of the five subjects (writing, social studies, mathematics, and science.) The 2009 *Recognized* standard of 75%, which applies to all subjects, is unchanged from the prior year.

Standards for 2010 will be published in the *2009 Accountability Manual* and adopted as commissioner rule before the 2009-10 school year begins. The 2010 *Recognized* standard is recommended to increase by five percentage points to 80% as previously planned. The 2010 *Academically Acceptable* standards are recommended to increase by five percentage points for both mathematics and science to 60% and 55%, respectively. The reading/English language arts (ELA), writing, and social studies standards are recommended to remain at 70% in 2010 to align with a recommended goal of standards of 70%, 80%, and 90% for *Academically Acceptable*, *Recognized*, and *Exemplary*, respectively, for all subject areas.

Focus Group Recommendation:

State Accountability Standards				
	2008 Used	2009 Adopted	2010 Recommended	2011 Preview
Exemplary	90%	90%	90%	90%
Recognized	75%	75%	80%	80%
Acceptable				
Reading/ELA	70%	70%	70%	70%
Writing, Soc. St.	65%	70%	70%	70%
Mathematics	50%	55%	60%	65%
Science	45%	50%	55%	60%
Changes to Indicator	Gr. 8 science; TAKS (Accommodated) – partial grades/subjects	Texas Projection Measure (TPM)	TAKS (Accommodated) –all grades/subjects; Vertical Scale Recalibration	Include new assessments: TAKS-Alt, TAKS-M, and ELL Progress Measure

Numbers in bold indicate an increase from the prior year.

Standards for 2011 will be reviewed in 2010 and are subject to change.

Rationale: Maintaining a 70% standard in reading/ELA, writing, and social studies in 2010 still represents increased rigor due to the planned phase-in of all TAKS (Accommodated) results in 2010. The addition of the remaining TAKS (Accommodated) grades and subjects adds approximately 100,000 more test takers to the accountability system. In 2008 these students had average passing rates ranging from 17% for Economically Disadvantaged in mathematics to 43% for White students in reading. Adding their results to the other 2.6 million students tested caused about a 3 point decline in state average percent passing rates. Campus and district level effects can be much more extreme than the averages shown at the state level. Even with the inclusion of additional TAKS (Accommodated) results in 2010 at grades 3 - 10, an increased passing standard is still recommended for mathematics. In addition, while science continues to be the primary reason that districts and campuses are limited from achieving the next higher rating, the planned five point increase in science will continue the annual increase in rigor toward the goal of 70% for *Academically Acceptable*.

For the *Recognized* standard, increasing the standard from 75% to 80% in 2010 is recommended despite the increased rigor from the inclusion of all TAKS (Accommodated) results in 2010.

In addition to the inclusion of all TAKS (Accommodated) grades and subjects in 2010, the conversion to the new vertical scale for grades 3 through 8 in reading and mathematics will also make the system more rigorous that year. Under Section 39.036 of the Texas Education Code, the TEA was required to develop a vertical scale for assessing student performance on the TAKS assessments in reading and mathematics for grades 3 through 8. With the vertical scale, a student's scale score in one grade can be compared to that student's scale score in another grade. The vertical scale will provide information about student growth compared to prior years. Vertical scale scores will be reported in 2009 but will not be used for accountability rating determinations until 2010. The student-level passing standards based on the vertical scale will be more rigorous for grades 6 and 8 reading (English); grade 6 reading (Spanish); and grades 3, 4, and 6 mathematics (Spanish).

3. Use of Texas Projection Measure. On January 8, 2009, the USDE approved the use of the Texas Projection Measure (TPM) in the calculations for Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) in 2009. The TPM provides a method for measuring annual student improvement that also satisfies state legislative requirements passed during the 79th and 80th Texas legislative sessions. TEC §39.034 requires the measurement of annual improvement of student achievement. The TPM that was developed for TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), and linguistically accommodated tests (LAT) is a multi-level regression-based prediction model. The model predicts student performance separately by subject in the next high-stakes grade (defined by Texas legislation as grades 5, 8, and 11). It uses current year scale scores and campus-level mean scores. Projection equations are developed the year before they are applied, so that the formulas can be published and shared across the state before they are used in state accountability or federal AYP calculations. For example, projection equations developed in 2008 will be applied in 2009 to predict student performance. A student projected to be at or above proficiency in the next high stakes grade is determined to have met the improvement standard. Projections will be made each year for all subjects for all students who have valid scores in reading/English language arts and mathematics. The equations will be updated each year after the spring TAKS administration and will be published before their use the following year.

Attachments A and B provide a preview of the 2009 and 2010 indicators, respectively, based on 2008 performance on TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), and TPM performance results.

Focus Group Recommendation:

Beginning in 2009, the Texas Projection Measure (TPM) is recommended to be used in determining ratings. The TPM will be evaluated as a means of elevating a campus or district rating in cases where neither the TAKS base indicator nor Required Improvement (RI) are sufficient to allow a campus or district to earn the next higher rating. For any TAKS measure not meeting the standard for the next higher rating, RI, TPM, or the Exceptions Provision can elevate the rating one level, and only one level. Combinations of RI, TPM, and the Exceptions Provision cannot be used together for one measure to elevate a rating more than one level. Different features can be used for different measures to successfully elevate a rating, but multiple features cannot be used for any one measure.

Of the population of students who did not pass the test for a given subject, the number who met the TPM is determined. This count of failers who are projected to pass at the next high-stakes grade level is added to the count of passers and a new percentage is calculated. The new percentage is named "TAKS Met Standard with TPM." If the "TAKS Met Standard with TPM" value is greater than or equal to the accountability standard for the subject, the measure meets the criteria for the next higher rating. If a student does not have a TPM for a test, that student is included in the TAKS indicator based on performance on the current year test. A TPM will be calculated for all grades and subjects except grade 7 writing and all subjects in grade 11. A TPM will not be available for grade 8 science until 2010.

Required Improvement: Required Improvement (RI) is calculated as the amount of gain in percent *Met Standard* required to reach the current year accountability standard in two years. RI for the TAKS indicator will continue to be defined as actual change in percent of students who scored high enough to meet the standard to pass the test. TPM will not be included in either the calculation to determine the Required Improvement standard or the calculation of actual change.

Exceptions: The minimum performance floor for the Exceptions Provision will continue to be defined as percentage points below the accountability standard of students who scored high enough to meet the standard to pass the test. Performance on the TPM will not be included in the calculation to determine if the measure meets the performance floor.

Rationale: The inclusion of the new student projection measure in the state accountability ratings system will parallel the use of the projection measure in the federal accountability system. The TPM has been approved by the USDE for use in the 2009 Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) calculations and will be reported on each student's Confidential Student Report (CSR) in spring 2009.

Educators have anticipated the development of a measure that rewards the progress that a student demonstrates toward achieving grade-level proficiency. A Student Assessment Advisory Committee of educators who provided feedback to the Texas Education Agency during development of the projection model supported use of the TPM in the state accountability system in 2009 without a reporting phase-in as long as the measure was applied in a way that could only help districts and campuses. Using it in a limited way that cannot have negative consequences in the accountability ratings is appropriate without a phase-in.

4. Exceptions Provision Minimum Performance Floor. The Exceptions Provision has been a feature of the accountability system since the 2004 ratings year. The rationale for the provision was to provide a mechanism for avoiding the *Academically Unacceptable* rating for new indicators or indicators that were being phased-in to the system. The mechanism was designed to provide greater relief for larger campuses and districts serving more diverse student populations who are evaluated on more measures. Since its implementation, very few campuses and districts have been limited by the safeguard that prevents the reuse of an exception for the same measure in consecutive years. For example, in 2008 only 11 campuses and one district could not use exceptions because the same measure was used in 2007. This indicates that campuses and districts are attending to the needs of the deficient student group(s) during the year of the exception. In short, data support that this provision is working as intended and that the safeguards appropriately prevent its abuse.

The Exceptions Provision was significantly modified in 2008. For the first time, districts and campuses could use the Exceptions Provision to achieve a *Recognized* or *Exemplary* rating. In addition, the number of exceptions allowed was increased from three to four in order to achieve the *Recognized* or *Academically Acceptable* ratings. (A maximum of one exception was permitted to achieve *Exemplary*.)

Focus Group Recommendation:

In 2008 the minimum performance floor for mathematics and science was relaxed to 10 points below the standard. Beginning in 2009, the minimum performance floor that must be met for an exception to be used is recommended to return to five points below the standard for all subjects.

Rationale: The use of the TPM in the 2009 ratings system supports the increased rigor of higher minimum floors in mathematics and science.

Completion Rate Indicator

The completion rate indicator is calculated as the number of completers expressed as a percent of total students in the class [graduates, continuing students, General Educational Development (GED) recipients, and dropouts]. Beginning with the class of 2005 and the ratings issued in 2006, only graduates and continuing students (students who return to school for a fifth year) count as high school completers for the completion rate evaluated under standard accountability procedures (Completion Rate I). Under alternative education accountability (AEA) procedures, alternative education campuses and charters are evaluated using Completion Rate II, which does include GED recipients as completers.

The *Exemplary* standard is a Completion Rate I of 95.0% or more. The *Recognized* standard is a Completion Rate I of 85.0% or more, and the *Academically Acceptable* standard is a Completion Rate I of 75.0% or more. The *AEA: Academically Acceptable* standard for Completion Rate II is 70.0% or more.

The 2007 accountability year (class of 2006) was the first year the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition was used. As shown in the table below, in the first year the new definition affected only one of four years in the cohort. For the class of 2007 two years of the cohort are affected, and so on, until the class of 2009 when the NCES dropout definition is used for all four years of the cohort.

Completion Rate Transition

				Completion Rate Method	
Accountability Year	Class of	Cohort Years	Dropout Definition	Numerator (CR I)	Denominator (CR I and CR II)
2007	2006	2002-03 2003-04 2004-05 2005-06	TEA TEA TEA NCES	Graduates + Continuers	Graduates+ Continuers+ GED Recipients+ Dropouts
2008	2007	2003-04 2004-05 2005-06 2006-07	TEA TEA NCES NCES	Graduates + Continuers	Graduates+ Continuers+ GED Recipients+ Dropouts
2009	2008	2004-05 2005-06 2006-07 2007-08	TEA NCES NCES NCES	Graduates + Continuers	Graduates+ Continuers+ GED Recipients+ Dropouts
2010	2009	2005-06 2006-07 2007-08 2008-09	NCES NCES NCES NCES	Graduates + Continuers	Graduates+ Continuers+ GED Recipients+ Dropouts

Text in bold indicates a change from the previous year.

Under the NCES dropout definition, there is an increase in the completion rate denominator and an increase in the number of dropouts. The longitudinal dropout rate more than doubled the first year of the phase in of the NCES definition (class of 2006).

1. School Leaver Provision. During the public comment period following publication of the proposed Commissioner of Education rule adopting portions of the *2008 Accountability Manual*, the agency received numerous comments regarding use of the completion and dropout indicators in the 2008 accountability system. In response to these concerns, the School Leaver Provision (SLP) that was implemented in 2007 was extended to the 2008 ratings. Under the SLP the completion rate, annual

dropout rate, and underreported students indicators could not be the sole cause for a lowered campus or district rating.

As a safeguard to the SLP, districts were subject to identification and intervention by Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) for dropout rates and leaver reporting. Additionally, campuses that avoided being rated *Academically Unacceptable* because of this provision are subject to technical assistance team (TAT) intervention requirements in the 2008-09 school year.

As detailed in the September 10, 2008, correspondence to district superintendents, the commissioner stated that the SLP will not continue beyond the 2008 accountability year. The letter encouraged districts to submit correct and complete leaver data and asked districts to continue to encourage students to return to school to complete coursework or exit-level testing requirements.

2. Standards. With the release of the *2008 Accountability Manual*, the 2009 standards for the grade 9-12 completion rate indicator were published to be the same in 2009 as they were in 2008—75.0%, 85.0%, and 95.0% for *Academically Acceptable*, *Recognized*, and *Exemplary*, respectively. However, a single standard of 75.0% is recommended for all rating categories—*Academically Acceptable*, *Recognized*, and *Exemplary*. During the 2010 development cycle, other options for 2011 and beyond will be considered.

Focus Group Recommendation:

Completion Rate Accountability Standards				
	Adopted	Recommended		
	2008	2009	2010	2011
Academically Acceptable	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%	≥ 75.0%	TBD
Recognized	≥ 85.0%			
Exemplary	≥ 95.0%			
Dropout Definition (by Cohort Years)	2003-04 – TEA 2004-05 – TEA 2005-06 – NCES 2006-07 – NCES	2004-05 – TEA 2005-06 – NCES 2006-07 – NCES 2007-08 – NCES	2005-06 – NCES 2006-07 – NCES 2007-08 – NCES 2008-09 – NCES	NCES definition

Bold text indicates a change from the previous year.

Rationale: The rigor of this indicator continues to increase incrementally each year until the NCES definition of a dropout is fully phased-in with the class of 2009. Due to increases in the dropout counts resulting from the definitional changes, many more campuses and districts meet the minimum size criteria to be evaluated on completion rates. For “All Students,” a campus or district must have a minimum of 5 dropouts, and at least 10 students in the class. For the individual student groups a minimum of 5 dropouts is required and the 30/10%/50 rule applies to the total number of students in the group.

Under standard procedures, a total of 894 campuses were evaluated for “All Students” in 2007 compared to 666 the year before. An additional 136 districts were evaluated for “All Students” (435 in 2007 compared to 299 the year before). In 2008 the assignment of the district completion rate to secondary campuses that do not have their own longitudinal completion rate was suspended. This change explains the lower numbers of campuses evaluated for completion rate in 2008. See the table below for details by student group.

<i>Number of Campuses Evaluated by Student Groups</i>						
<i>Accountability Year</i>	<i>Class Year</i>	<i>All Students</i>	<i>African American</i>	<i>Hispanic</i>	<i>White</i>	<i>Economically Disadvantaged</i>
2008	Class of 2007	753	187	438	299	496
2007	Class of 2006	894	294	606	416	669
2006	Class of 2005	666	168	440	252	465
2005	Class of 2004	668	180	436	254	434
2004*	Class of 2003	501	118	305	136	273
<i>Number of Districts Evaluated by Student Groups</i>						
2008	Class of 2007	468	117	259	246	319
2007	Class of 2006	435	122	268	219	311
2006	Class of 2005	299	69	184	130	200
2005	Class of 2004	291	69	174	125	180
2004*	Class of 2003	196	36	111	62	104

* Minimum size criteria required at least 10 dropouts. Beginning with 2005 ratings this was reduced to a minimum of 5.

Also, the changes to graduation requirements to comply with attainment of the “4 x 4” curriculum (beginning with 2007-08 ninth graders) contribute toward more rigorous graduation requirements for students. The class of 2011 will be the first to graduate having completed four years of study in each of four core academic areas.

There is no Exception Provision for the completion rate indicator and the SLP is no longer available beginning with 2009. Any single rate (meeting minimum size criteria) that misses the standard will result in a lower rating for the campus or district. A single standard for all rating categories reduces the punitive effect of this indicator *only* for campuses and districts that otherwise meet all *Recognized* and *Exemplary* criteria. A change to a single standard is also consistent with the 2008 change to a single standard for the annual dropout rate.

3. **Required Improvement.** Districts and campuses will be able to meet the completion rate criteria by either meeting the absolute standard or demonstrating RI. With a single completion rate standard for all rating categories, the same RI calculation will be applied for each rating category. Campuses and districts that demonstrate enough improvement in their rates to reach the standard in two years will be considered to have met the completion rate criteria. A campus or district cannot be prevented from a rating of *Exemplary*, *Recognized*, or *Academically Acceptable* if it has either met the absolute completion rate standard or demonstrated completion rate RI. No minimum floor is required to be able to use RI for the completion rate, whether moving to *Academically Acceptable*, *Recognized*, or *Exemplary*. However, it may be difficult for some districts and campuses to show any improvement on the completion rate indicator while the NCES definition is being phased-in.

Grade 7-8 Annual Dropout Rate Indicator

For standard accountability purposes, the annual dropout rate has been used to evaluate campuses and districts with students in grades 7 and/or 8 since 2004. It is a one year measure, calculated by summing the number of dropouts across the two grades. Performance is evaluated for “All Students” and the following student groups: African American, Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged. The methodology for this rate is the number of grade 7-8 students designated as dropouts divided by the number of grade 7-8 students who were in attendance at any time during the school year. These results are evaluated at the “All Students” level if there are at least 10 students in grades 7-8 and there are at least 5 dropouts. The other student groups are evaluated if there are at least 5 dropouts within the student group and the student group is at least 30 students and comprises at least 10% of “All Students,” or there are at least 50 students within the group.

1. School Leaver Provision. The 2007 accountability cycle (which evaluated 2005-06 dropouts) was the first year the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) dropout definition was used. That year a School Leaver Provision (SLP) was added to the system. Under the SLP the annual dropout rate, completion rate, or underreported students indicator could not be the sole cause for a lowered campus or district rating. As with the completion rate and the underreported indicator, the SLP was extended to the 2008 ratings year. However, the SLP is discontinued for this indicator beginning with the 2009 accountability ratings cycle.
2. Standards. In 2008 the grade 7-8 annual dropout rate standard was reset to 2.0% for all rating levels, with a multi-year phase-in process for ultimately achieving a rate of 1.0%. Doubling the standard from 1.0% to 2.0% made it comparable to the standard used to evaluate rates under the prior definition. The recommendation is to continue with the phase-in plan previously published. See table below.

Focus Group Recommendation:

Grade 7-8 Annual Dropout Rate Accountability Standards					
	Adopted		Recommended		
	2008 Ratings	2009 Ratings	2010 Ratings	2011 Ratings	2012 Ratings
	2006-07 dropouts	2007-08 dropouts	2008-09 dropouts	2009-10 dropouts	2010-11 dropouts
<i>Exemplary, Recognized, Academically Acceptable</i>	2.0%	2.0%	1.8%	1.6%	1.4%

Rationale: A standard of 2.0% was set for both 2008 and 2009 to provide additional time for campuses and districts to adjust local programs to target categories of students not previously identified as dropouts and to adjust recovery activities to correlate with the school start window. Also, beginning with dropouts from 2007-08, the grade 8 Student Success Initiative is implemented. The effect of that policy on the grade 8 dropout rate used for 2009 ratings is unknown.

Underreported Students Indicator

An underreported student is a student in grades 7-12 reported in enrollment or attendance in one school year that has not been accounted for through district records or Texas Education Agency (TEA) processing the next school year. Districts account for students by reporting that students re-enrolled in school or withdrew from school. TEA accounts for students by determining that students either moved from one district into another, received General Educational Development (GED) certificates, or graduated in a previous school year.

The underreported students' rate is calculated by dividing the number of underreported students by the total number of students served in the prior year. From 2005-06 to 2006-07, the number of underreported students at the state level declined by 2,571 to 13,316, and the underreported students rate decreased by 0.1 percentage points to 0.7 percent.

Underreported Students, 2005-06 and 2006-07

Underreported students				
Accountability year	data year	Numerator	Denominator	Rate (%)
2007	2005-06	15,887	2,018,935	0.8
2008	2006-07	13,316	2,025,937	0.7

The counts and rates of underreported students have been used as data quality measures in the accountability system since the 2000 accountability year. Performance is evaluated for "All Students."

Districts cannot be rated *Exemplary* or *Recognized* if either the count or rate of underreported students exceeds the standards. Results are evaluated if there are at least 5 underreported students.

The underreported indicator has also been used in the Performance-Based Monitoring (PBM) Data Validation System since 2004. Districts that did not meet the underreported standards were subject to interventions. The interventions are graduated depending on district data results on each leaver data validation indicator, patterns across all leaver data validation indicators, and prior leaver data validation history. The standards proposed will be applied to the PBM Data Validation System for 2009 and beyond.

1. School Leaver Provision. The School Leaver Provision (SLP) is discontinued for this indicator beginning with the 2009 accountability ratings cycle.
2. Standards. In 2010, change the underreported students indicator by increasing the rigor of the rate to 4.0%, but maintain the count standard at 150. Continue to increase the rigor of the rate by decreasing one percentage point per year through 2012. See table below.

Focus Group Recommendation:

Underreported Students Indicator Accountability Standards				
Counts / Rates				
2008 (2006-07 data)	2009 (2007-08 data)	2010 (2008-09 data)	2011 (2009-10 data)	2012 (2010-11 data)
200 / 5.0%	150 / 5.0%	150 / 4.0%	150 / 3.0%	150 / 2.0%

Rationale: These rates reflect the rates many districts are already achieving. Maintaining a count of 150 underreported students is a more reasonable standard for larger districts given that the count represents a very small percentage of their students. The increases in rates accelerate progress toward previous standards that were in place prior to processing changes associated with implementation of the NCES dropout definition.

The underreported measure provides important safeguards to the dropout rate and completion rate indicators, as students who might otherwise be dropouts or non-completers cannot go unreported. Also, the quality of any longitudinal data depends heavily on the accuracy of student tracking over time.

Hurricane Ike

Hurricane Ike made landfall near Galveston on September 13, 2008. That same day FEMA declared 29 Texas counties and 14 Louisiana parishes as disaster areas that qualify for both individual and public assistance. The disaster areas include all counties in ESC regions 4 and 5, more than half the counties in ESC regions 6 and 7, and Matagorda County in region 3.

On September 25 the commissioner informed superintendents that TEA had declared Hurricane Ike a state education-related crisis, activating PEIMS Crisis Code reporting for students displaced by the hurricane for the 2008-09 data submissions. In this case, the PEIMS Crisis Code is used for students who were enrolled in one of the disaster counties or parishes before September 9, and were enrolled on the PEIMS snapshot date in another Texas public school district or in a different campus in the same district because of Hurricane Ike.

Focus Group Recommendations:

1. Displaced Students. Remove performance results of all displaced students due to Hurricane Ike from assessment indicators before determining 2009 accountability ratings. Use the PEIMS Crisis Code from the student fall 2008 enrollment record to identify displaced students. Use of the code will rely

on matching student identifying information on the test answer document with the PEIMS record. Test answer documents for matched students with PEIMS Crisis Code values of '01' or '02' will be excluded from the accountability results. It is estimated that about 7,800 students meet these criteria.

Code	Translation
01	Indicates that a student was enrolled in a Texas school before September 9, 2008, in a Texas county declared a disaster area because of Hurricane Ike, and the student enrolled in another Texas public school district, or moved from a Hurricane Ike impacted campus, to a non-impacted campus during the 2008-09 school year.
02	Indicates that a student came to Texas after September 9, 2008, from a Louisiana parish declared a disaster area because of Hurricane Ike and the student enrolled in a Texas public school district during the 2008-09 school year.

Guidelines will be developed for the evaluation of appeals related to the performance of displaced students.

2. Districts Directly Affected by Hurricane Ike. Implement a Hurricane Ike Provision following the example of the Hurricane Rita Provision used in 2006. Districts directly affected by Hurricane Ike are eligible for special evaluation if (a) they are located in one of the 29 Texas counties designated by FEMA as a disaster area due to Hurricane Ike and (b) they were closed for ten or more instructional days between September 10, 2008 and late October, 2008. However, unlike the Rita Provision, restrict application of this provision to ratings governed by the TAKS indicator only. Ratings for 2009 determined by either the dropout or completion rates are not eligible for this provision.

Under the Hurricane Ike Provision, accountability ratings will be generated for eligible districts and campuses using available data. If the 2009 rating is either *Academically Unacceptable* or lower than the rating received in 2008 and is based on 2008-09 assessment results, TEA will issue a rating of *Not Rated: Other* on July 31. For these campuses and districts, a message will be included on the data table stating that the Hurricane Ike Provision was used. Districts could appeal to have the system-generated rating assigned. Any hurricane-affected district/campus not identified as eligible for this provision could appeal under the regular appeals process. For purposes of counting consecutive years of ratings, 2008 and 2010 will be considered consecutive for districts and campuses receiving a *Not Rated: Other* label in 2009 due to hurricane-related issues.

Rationale: These recommendations are similar to the decisions made in 2006 regarding Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. The recommendation to exclude the performance of displaced students recognizes that districts and campuses should not be penalized through the accountability system for serving students who have been through a traumatic event that puts them at an educational disadvantage. The recommendation to apply a special evaluation of the rating generated for districts closed for ten or more instructional days recognizes the extreme hardship caused by the hurricane in some communities. The restricted application of this provision to ratings governed by the TAKS indicator ensures that ratings governed by prior year dropout or completion rates are appropriately issued since those data were from the school year prior to the hurricane.

Gold Performance Acknowledgments

1. RHSP/DAP Indicator. For 2010 and 2011, maintain the combined RHSP/DAP indicator as previously defined and evaluate campuses and districts using the standards shown in the table below. Consider publishing counts of DAP graduates separately from the RHSP graduates on the Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS).
2. SAT/ACT Indicator. For 2010 and 2011 continue to use only the critical reading and mathematics components of the SAT, maintaining the same standards that were used for 2008. Propose new options for the SAT/ACT indicator for discussion during the 2010 development cycle. Pursue options for reporting SAT writing results on the 2009-10 AEIS.

3. Comparable Improvement Indicator. Continue to use the Texas Growth Index (TGI) as the measure to establish Comparable Improvement (CI) for the 2009 ratings cycle. Beginning in 2010 CI must use a different measure of improvement. Research will be conducted and options will be presented to advisory groups in 2010 for implementation using a new measure beginning with the 2010 ratings cycle.
4. College-Ready Graduates. Add the college-ready graduates indicator that has been reported in the AEIS reports since 2006-07 to the GPA indicators. Evaluate it for “Both Subjects” only at a standard of 35%. As with other GPA indicators, “All Students” results will always be evaluated, regardless of the number of students. Student groups may or may not be evaluated, depending on their size. The 30/10%/50 rule will be applied to determine if student groups meet the minimum size criteria.

To be considered college-ready as defined by this indicator, a graduate must have met or exceeded the college-ready criteria on the TAKS exit-level test, or the SAT test, or the ACT test. The criterion for each is:

Subject	Exit-level TAKS		SAT		ACT
ELA	>= 2200 scale score on ELA test AND a “3” or higher on essay	OR	>=500 on Critical Reading AND >=1070 Total*	OR	>= 19 on English AND >= 23 Composite
Math	>= 2200 scale score on mathematics test	OR	>=500 on Math AND >=1070 Total*	OR	>= 19 on Math AND >= 23 Composite

* Total is the sum of Critical Reading and Mathematics. It does not include Writing.

College-ready in both subjects is the count of graduates who scored at or above the college-ready criteria on both the ELA and mathematics subjects divided by the number of graduates with results in both subjects to evaluate.

Rationale: Use of this indicator in 2009 follows the established “report, report, use” phase-in policy. This is the only indicator among the “college-readiness” indicators reported on the AEIS that is not a GPA indicator. Adding it gives it similar status. Evaluating the “Both Subjects” measure instead of the individual subjects distinguishes it from the TSI ELA and mathematics indicators.

5. Standards. GPA standards for 2009 were set in 2008 and are shown in the table below. In 2009, standards increase for nine of the 14 previous indicators. The new college-ready graduates indicator is implemented in 2009 with a standard of 35%.

As recommended by previous focus groups, increase standards for the two TSI indicators in 2010. No increases for any of the 15 indicators are recommended for 2011.

The GPA indicators in the table below will continue to be evaluated for AEA campuses and charters as will the new college-ready graduates indicator. Under AEA GPA procedures, the same standards are applied as are used under standard accountability procedures, with the following exceptions:

- The two Comparable Improvement indicators are not evaluated for AEA campuses.
- An attendance rate standard of 95% is applied to all AEA campuses and charters.
- Only the “All Students” group is evaluated for AEA GPA purposes.

	GPA Indicators	2009	2010	2011
1	Advanced Course / Dual Enrollment Completion	>= 30.0%	>= 30.0%	>= 30.0%
2	Advanced Placement / International Baccalaureate Results	>=15.0% and >=50.0%	>=15.0% and >=50.0%	>=15.0% and >=50.0%
3	Attendance Rate	>=95.0% (HS & AEA) >=96.0% (MS, K-12, & district) >=97.0% (EL)	>=95.0% (HS & AEA) >=96.0% (MS, K-12, & district) >=97.0% (EL)	>=95.0% (HS & AEA) >=96.0% (MS, K-12, & district) >=97.0% (EL)
4 – 8	Commended Performance: Reading/English Language Arts Mathematics Writing Science Social Studies	>=30.0%	>=30.0%	>=30.0%
9	Recommended High School Program/Distinguished Achievement Program	>=85.0%	>=85.0%	>=85.0%
10	SAT/ACT Results (College Admissions Tests) Reading and mathematics components of the new SAT only.	>=70.0% and >=40.0%	>=70.0% and >=40.0%	>=70.0% and >=40.0%
11	Texas Success Initiative: Higher Education Readiness Component—English Language Arts	>=60.0%	>=65.0%	>=65.0%
12	Texas Success Initiative: Higher Education Readiness Component—Mathematics	>=60.0%	>=65.0%	>=65.0%
13- 14	Comparable Improvement (campus-only, and not evaluated for AEA) Reading/ELA Mathematics	Top Quartile (top 25%)	Top Quartile (top 25%)	Top Quartile (top 25%)
15	College-Ready Graduates	>=35.0%	>=35.0%	>=35.0%

TAKS-Modified and TAKS-Alternate

TAKS-Modified (TAKS-M) is an alternate assessment based on modified academic achievement standards designed to meet the requirements of the federal No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) and Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). TAKS-M is intended for a small number of students served by special education who meet participation criteria. TAKS-M is based on the grade-level Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS) curriculum, but the assessment itself is modified. In the 2007-08 school year, TAKS-M was administered to students in grades and subjects required for federal accountability; beginning in 2008-09 the test will be administered in additional grades as shown in the following table. To meet federal accountability requirements, the student passing standard was set in summer 2008 on the grades and subjects assessed statewide that year. In the summer of 2009, student passing standards will be set on the remaining grades and subjects.

Introduction of TAKS-M to Assessment Program		
	2007-08	2008-09
Reading/ELA (grades 3-8, & 10) Mathematics (grades 3-8, & 10) Science (grades 5, 8, & 10)	First statewide administration with results used to set student passing standard Report only in AEIS (state-level only)	Second statewide administration Report only in AEIS
Reading/ELA (grades 9 & 11) Writing (grades 4 & 7) Mathematics (grades 9 & 11) Science (grade 11) Social Studies (grades 8, 10, & 11)	Field test only	First statewide administration with results used to set student passing standard Report only in AEIS

TAKS-Alternate (TAKS-Alt) is an alternate assessment based on alternate academic achievement standards and is designed for students with significant cognitive disabilities. TAKS-Alt is not a traditional paper or multiple-choice test. It is a teacher observation assessment that measures student progress on prerequisite skills that are linked to grade-level content standards. TAKS-Alt is administered in the same grades and subjects as the TAKS: reading at grades 3-9; ELA at grades 10 and 11; writing at grades 4 and 7; mathematics at grades 3-11; science at grades 5, 8, 10, and 11; and social studies at grades 8, 10, and 11.

On July 30, 2008, TEA signed a Memorandum of Agreement with USDE that outlined the criteria for adjustments needed to bring TAKS-Alt into compliance for use as an alternate assessment for students with disabilities. In order to meet the USDE requirements, and also to incorporate feedback from districts, a number of changes were implemented for the 2008-09 TAKS-Alt administration. Final approval of the TAKS-Alt assessment is anticipated in summer 2009.

1. Separate Indicators or Combined Results. Add TAKS-Modified (TAKS-M) results to the TAKS base indicator, combining results on TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), and TAKS-M. Evaluate TAKS-Alternate (TAKS-Alt) as a separate base indicator with test scores summed across grades and subjects and evaluated at the "All Students" level only.
2. Growth for TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt. Use the TPM as soon as it becomes available for each TAKS-M grade rather than waiting until the TPM is available for all grades. Use growth for TAKS-Alt when a growth model is developed.
3. Schedule for Use of TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt. Plan to begin using TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt results for accountability ratings with the 2011 ratings. This schedule follows the established "report, report, use" phase-in policy recommended for integration of new assessment results into the accountability ratings. Preview indicators will be reported in the 2008-09 and 2009-10 AEIS reports. The 2010 educator focus group will evaluate options when impact models can be developed that incorporate TAKS-M results for all grades and TAKS-Alt results under the revised test. They will make recommendations regarding implementation of this plan, including recommendations regarding accountability standards for 2011 and beyond for the TAKS base indicator and new TAKS-Alt indicator.

Rationale: Both TAKS-M and TAKS-Alt are linked to the same grade-level curriculum standards as the TAKS and TAKS (Accommodated). The TAKS-M assessment covers the same grade-level content as TAKS, but TAKS-M tests have been changed in format (larger font, fewer items per page, etc.) and test design (fewer answer choices, simpler vocabulary and sentence structure, etc.). The inclusion of TAKS-M in the base indicator will significantly increase the number of special education students evaluated in the rating system. However, scoring of the TAKS-Alt is done by the teacher of record and combining TAKS-Alt results with the other TAKS results may have the unintended consequence of lowering expectations so that overall TAKS performance will rise. Using the TAKS-Alt assessment as a separate base indicator will parallel the use of the State Developed Alternative Assessment II (SDAA II) in the state ratings system in 2005 – 2007.

English Language Learners Progress Measure

1. Schedule for Use of ELL Progress Measure. Incorporate the English Language Learners (ELL) progress measure in the ratings as a separate indicator evaluated at the “All Students” level only, beginning with the 2011 ratings. This schedule follows the established “report, report, use” phase-in policy recommended for integration of new assessment results into the accountability ratings. The ELL progress measure based on TELPAS reading will be reported in the 2008-09 and 2009-10 AEIS reports. The 2008-09 ELL progress measure is based on 2007-08 and 2008-09 TELPAS reading results and 2008-09 TAKS performance. Based on the 2008-09 ELL progress measure, the 2010 focus group will set accountability standards on this new indicator for 2011. Other issues such as eligibility for the Exceptions Provision, Required Improvement, and minimum size criteria will also be established during the 2010 development cycle.
2. Growth for ELL. A proposal for including the TPM in the ELL progress measure will be developed for focus group consideration during the 2010 development cycle.

Rationale: The performance of ELL students is not available for use in accountability before 2011 since two years of TELPAS reading results are needed to create one year of ELL progress. The 2008-09 ELL progress results will be used during the 2010 development cycle to set standards and determine other criteria.

When the ELL measure is integrated into the state accountability system, a number of students will be evaluated in the system that have formerly not been included due to exemptions from the TAKS assessments. For example, students who are served by district LEP programs and LEP-exempt from the TAKS test and assessed on TELPAS reading only will be included in the state accountability system for the first time. Until then, although ELL students are not evaluated on a separate indicator or as a separate student group, the overwhelming majority of ELL students will continue to be included in the state accountability system through the TAKS or TAKS (Accommodated) tests in English and Spanish in selected subjects and grades and in the completion and dropout rate indicators. In the federal accountability system, the ELL students have been evaluated as a separate student group for both performance and participation components of the reading/ELA and mathematics indicators as defined in AYP since 2003.

Preview of 2009 Indicator—2008 TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), and TPM Performance Results

Subject and Student Group	2008 Accountability Indicator [TAKS and partial TAKS (Accommodated)] (1)	2008 Met Texas Projection Measure (TPM) but Did Not Meet Standard (2)	2009 Accountability Modeling: Met Standard OR Met TPM (3) [(1) + (2)]
Reading/ELA	Includes TAKS (Accommodated) for gr. 11 only		
All Students	2,371,606 / 2,615,004 = 91%	133,238 / 2,615,004 = 5%	2,504,844 / 2,615,004 = 96%
African American	305,852 / 353,139 = 87%	23,653 / 353,139 = 7%	329,505 / 353,139 = 93%
Hispanic	1,030,345 / 1,184,201 = 87%	84,427 / 1,184,201 = 7%	1,114,772 / 1,184,201 = 94%
White	935,376 / 973,472 = 96%	22,640 / 973,472 = 2%	958,016 / 973,472 = 98%
Economically Disadvantaged	1,145,679 / 1,331,779 = 86%	99,574 / 1,331,779 = 7%	1,245,253 / 1,331,779 = 94%
Mathematics	Includes TAKS (Accommodated) for gr. 11 only		
All Students	2,090,305 / 2,601,232 = 80%	191,143 / 2,601,232 = 7%	2,281,448 / 2,601,232 = 88%
African American	239,934 / 349,885 = 69%	39,061 / 349,885 = 11%	278,995 / 349,885 = 80%
Hispanic	889,113 / 1,179,008 = 75%	100,466 / 1,179,008 = 9%	989,579 / 1,179,008 = 84%
White	863,639 / 967,962 = 89%	48,737 / 967,962 = 5%	912,376 / 967,962 = 94%
Economically Disadvantaged	974,810 / 1,324,834 = 74%	121,214 / 1,324,834 = 9%	1,096,024 / 1,324,834 = 83%
Science	Includes gr. 8 & TAKS (Accommodated)		
All Students	832,799 / 1,123,287 = 74%	62,427 / 1,123,287 = 6%	895,226 / 1,123,287 = 80%
African American	92,978 / 153,481 = 61%	11,785 / 153,481 = 8%	104,763 / 153,481 = 68%
Hispanic	319,821 / 486,799 = 66%	33,792 / 486,799 = 7%	353,613 / 486,799 = 73%
White	379,547 / 437,385 = 87%	15,384 / 437,385 = 4%	394,931 / 437,385 = 90%
Economically Disadvantaged	340,131 / 535,839 = 63%	37,312 / 535,839 = 7%	377,443 / 535,839 = 70%
Social Studies	Includes TAKS (Accommodated)		
All Students	745,253 / 814,752 = 91%	50,310 / 814,752 = 6%	795,563 / 814,752 = 98%
African American	97,822 / 112,276 = 87%	10,140 / 112,276 = 9%	107,962 / 112,276 = 96%
Hispanic	299,484 / 340,782 = 88%	30,160 / 340,782 = 9%	329,644 / 340,782 = 97%
White	315,580 / 328,300 = 96%	9,343 / 328,300 = 3%	324,923 / 328,300 = 99%
Economically Disadvantaged	314,807 / 363,567 = 87%	35,397 / 363,567 = 10%	350,204 / 363,567 = 96%
Writing			
All Students	546,111 / 588,202 = 93%	18,469 / 588,202 = 3%	564,580 / 588,202 = 96%
African American	71,254 / 79,002 = 90%	3,477 / 79,002 = 4%	74,731 / 79,002 = 95%
Hispanic	251,106 / 275,677 = 91%	9,941 / 275,677 = 4%	261,047 / 275,677 = 95%
White	201,137 / 210,323 = 96%	4,787 / 210,323 = 2%	205,924 / 210,323 = 98%
Economically Disadvantaged	287,437 / 319,337 = 90%	13,719 / 319,337 = 4%	301,156 / 319,337 = 94%

Preview of 2010 Indicator—2008 TAKS, TAKS (Accommodated), and TPM Performance Results

Subject and Student Group	2008 Accountability [TAKS and partial TAKS (Acc)]	2008 TAKS (Acc) Remaining Grades & Subjects Only	2008 TAKS and All TAKS (Acc) (3)	2008 Met TPM but Did Not Meet Std	2010 Accountability Met Std OR Met TPM (5)
	(1)	(2)	(1) + (2) + Vertical Scale*	(4)	(3) + (4)
Reading/ELA					
All Students	2,371,606 / 2,615,004 = 91%	30,881 / 98,880 = 31%	2,360,937 / 2,713,884 = 87%	204,687 / 2,713,884 = 8%	2,565,624 / 2,713,884 = 95%
African American	305,852 / 353,139 = 87%	4,798 / 18,978 = 25%	302,909 / 372,117 = 81%	36,879 / 372,117 = 10%	339,788 / 372,117 = 91%
Hispanic	1,030,345 / 1,184,201 = 87%	11,713 / 45,956 = 25%	1,016,723 / 1,230,157 = 83%	124,308 / 1,230,157 = 10%	1,141,031 / 1,230,157 = 93%
White	935,376 / 973,472 = 96%	13,916 / 32,702 = 43%	941,540 / 1,006,174 = 94%	39,851 / 1,006,174 = 4%	981,391 / 1,006,174 = 98%
Economically Disadvantaged	1,145,679 / 1,331,779 = 86%	17,409 / 67,024 = 26%	1,132,200 / 1,398,803 = 81%	151,051 / 1,398,803 = 11%	1,283,251 / 1,398,803 = 92%
Mathematics					
All Students	2,090,305 / 2,601,232 = 80%	20,982 / 102,592 = 20%	2,108,076 / 2,703,824 = 78%	203,477 / 2,703,824 = 8%	2,311,553 / 2,703,824 = 85%
African American	239,934 / 349,885 = 69%	2,505 / 19,550 = 13%	242,437 / 369,435 = 66%	40,961 / 369,435 = 11%	283,398 / 369,435 = 77%
Hispanic	889,113 / 1,179,008 = 75%	8,545 / 47,390 = 18%	894,459 / 1,226,398 = 73%	105,553 / 1,226,398 = 9%	1,000,012 / 1,226,398 = 82%
White	863,639 / 967,962 = 89%	9,536 / 34,372 = 28%	873,169 / 1,002,334 = 87%	53,910 / 1,002,334 = 5%	927,079 / 1,002,334 = 92%
Economically Disadvantaged	974,810 / 1,324,834 = 74%	12,002 / 69,032 = 17%	983,783 / 1,393,866 = 71%	128,608 / 1,393,866 = 9%	1,112,391 / 1,393,866 = 80%
Science					
All Students	832,799 / 1,123,287 = 74%		832,799 / 1,123,287 = 74%	62,427 / 1,123,287 = 6%	895,226 / 1,123,287 = 80%
African American	92,978 / 153,481 = 61%		92,978 / 153,481 = 61%	11,785 / 153,481 = 8%	104,763 / 153,481 = 68%
Hispanic	319,821 / 486,799 = 66%		319,821 / 486,799 = 66%	33,792 / 486,799 = 7%	353,613 / 486,799 = 73%
White	379,547 / 437,385 = 87%		379,547 / 437,385 = 87%	15,384 / 437,385 = 4%	394,931 / 437,385 = 90%
Economically Disadvantaged	340,131 / 535,839 = 63%		340,131 / 535,839 = 63%	37,312 / 535,839 = 7%	377,443 / 535,839 = 70%
Social Studies					
All Students	745,253 / 814,752 = 91%		745,253 / 814,752 = 91%	50,310 / 814,752 = 6%	795,563 / 814,752 = 98%
African American	97,822 / 112,276 = 87%		97,822 / 112,276 = 87%	10,140 / 112,276 = 9%	107,962 / 112,276 = 96%
Hispanic	299,484 / 340,782 = 88%		299,484 / 340,782 = 88%	30,160 / 340,782 = 9%	329,644 / 340,782 = 97%
White	315,580 / 328,300 = 96%		315,580 / 328,300 = 96%	9,343 / 328,300 = 3%	324,923 / 328,300 = 99%
Economically Disadvantaged	314,807 / 363,567 = 87%		314,807 / 363,567 = 87%	35,397 / 363,567 = 10%	350,204 / 363,567 = 96%
Writing					
All Students	546,111 / 588,202 = 93%	10,396 / 23,851 = 44%	556,507 / 612,053 = 91%	21,749 / 612,053 = 4%	578,256 / 612,053 = 94%
African American	71,254 / 79,002 = 90%	1,744 / 4,422 = 39%	72,998 / 83,424 = 88%	4,056 / 83,424 = 5%	77,054 / 83,424 = 92%
Hispanic	251,106 / 275,677 = 91%	4,595 / 11,147 = 41%	255,701 / 286,824 = 89%	11,368 / 286,824 = 4%	267,069 / 286,824 = 93%
White	201,137 / 210,323 = 96%	3,894 / 7,977 = 49%	205,031 / 218,300 = 94%	6,026 / 218,300 = 3%	211,057 / 218,300 = 97%
Economically Disadvantaged	287,437 / 319,337 = 90%	6,436 / 16,305 = 39%	293,873 / 335,642 = 88%	15,974 / 335,642 = 5%	309,847 / 335,642 = 92%

* Results in column (3) are the sum of columns (1) and (2) with adjustments made to reflect higher passing standards due to use of vertical scale scores in 2010.